

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:
G.E. EHRLICH (1995) LTD.
11 MENACHEM BEGIN STREET
RAMAT GAN, ISRAEL 52521

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

15 JUL 2008

Applicant's or agent's file reference 29995		FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below	
International application No. PCT/IL05/00954	International filing date (day/month/year) 08 September 2005 (08.09.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 08 September 2004 (08.09.2004)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC IPC: A61K 38/03 (2006.01);C07K 1/00 (2006.01),1/13 (2006.01),4/00 (2006.01) USPC: 530/300			
Applicant RAMOT AT TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY LTD.			

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPBA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPBA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPBA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/US Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201	Date of completion of this opinion 16 June 2008 (16.06.2008)	Authorized officer Signature: <i>Marjorie Moran</i> Marjorie Moran Telephone No. 571-272-1600.
---	---	---

Form PCT/ISA/237 (cover sheet) (April 2007)

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IL05/00954

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - the international application in the language in which it was filed
 - a translation of the international application into _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (Rules 12.3(a) and 23.1(b)).
2. This opinion has been established taking into account the rectification of an obvious mistake authorized by or notified to this Authority under Rule 91 (Rule 43bis.1(a)).
3. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
 - a sequence listing
 - table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
 - on paper
 - in electronic form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
 - contained in the international application as filed.
 - filed together with the international application in electronic form.
 - furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
4. In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.

5. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/IL05/00954

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

the entire international application
 claims Nos. 6,8,12-18,20-24 and 27-121

because:

the said international application, or the said claim Nos. _____ relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international search (specify):

the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. 6,8,12-18,20-24 and 27-121 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):

Claims 6, 8, 12-18, 20-24, and 27-121 are not examined because they are in improper multiple dependent form under PCT Rule 6.4 (a).

the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):

no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____

a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the sequence listing; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit:

furnish a sequence listing on paper complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

furnish a sequence listing in electronic form complying with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions, and such listing was not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

pay the required late furnishing fee for the furnishing of a sequence listing in response to an invitation under Rules 13ter, 1(a) or (b).

a meaningful opinion could not be formed without the tables related to the sequence listings; the applicant did not, within the prescribed time limit, furnish such tables in electronic form complying with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions, and such tables were not available to the International Searching Authority in a form and manner acceptable to it.

the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in electronic form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

See Supplemental Box for further details.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITYInternational application No.
PCT/IL05/00954

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43 bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims 5	YES
	Claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 19, 25-26	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims 5	YES
	Claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 19, 25-26	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 19, 25-26	YES
	Claims NONE	NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Claims 1-4, 7, 9-11, 19, and 25-26 lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by McGimpsey (US 2003/0144185). McGimpsey discloses a nanotube with cyclic peptide structures (abstract) with an aromatic amino acid and end-capping modified peptide (0007, 0046). McGimpsey discloses the peptide structure containing chromophore residues (abstract). McGimpsey discloses polyaromatic peptides (0053). McGimpsey discloses methods for generating the nanostructures (i.e. abstract, 0031, 0037). Thus, McGimpsey anticipates the limitations in these claims.

Claim 5 meets the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the limitations in this claim.

Claims 1-5, 7, 9-11, 19, and 25-26 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus meet the requirements of industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.